

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/510,747	02/22/2000	Huey Ly	10992824-1	3079	
22879 7590 10/02/2003		EXAMINER WOOD, WILLIAM H			
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION					
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			2124	1.1	
			DATE MAILED: 10/02/2003	$\ell$	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· . • ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/510,747	LY, HUEY
	Examiner	Art Unit
	William H. Wood	2124
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 05 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to available final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicate a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a  h places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of to (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 Cl	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CFI extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension on the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	•	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	cause:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require furthe	r consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	elow);	
(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would I canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: <u>See</u>	reconsideration has been consideration Sheet.	dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	use it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment( explanation of how the new or amended claims wo		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected:  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		VM_
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement 10. Other:	t(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	lodd Ingberg mary Examiner Group 2100

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant continues to argue there is no motivation to combine the references. However, the motivation is laid out in the previous rejections and arguments to support the rejections. No new information has been presented as to disuade one from the obviouness of the rejection. Along the same lines, Applicant argues Touboul would be destroyed by the combination, yet this remains to be seen for at least the reasons stated in the previous office action. Additionally, the very next paragraph of Touboul (column 2, lines 18-20) mentions providing agents. No evidence that Touboul would be destroyed has been persuasively presented. All other arguments are believed to be representative to previously refuted argements and the rejection is maintained as originally stated..

Todd Ingberg Primary Examin